arXiv:1701.02817v1 [math.AP] 11 Jan 2017

A unified method for boundedness in fully parabolic chemotaxis systems with signal-dependent sensitivity

Masaaki Mizukami
Department of Mathematics, Tokyo University of Science
1-3, Kagurazaka, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 162-8601, Japan
masaaki.mizukami.math@gmail.com

Tomomi Yokota* †
Department of Mathematics, Tokyo University of Science
1-3, Kagurazaka, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 162-8601, Japan
yokota@rs.kagu.tus.ac.jp

January 12, 2017

Abstract. This paper deals with the Keller–Segel system

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - \nabla \cdot (u\chi(v)\nabla v), & x \in \Omega,\ t > 0, \\ v_t = \Delta v + u - v, & x \in \Omega,\ t > 0, \end{cases}$$

where Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$, $n \geq 2$; χ is a function satisfying $\chi(s) \leq K(a+s)^{-k}$ for some $k \geq 1$ and $a \geq 0$. In the case that $k = 1$, Fujie (J. Math. Anal. Appl.; 2015; 424; 675–684) established global existence of bounded solutions under the condition $K < \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}}$. On the other hand, when $k > 1$, Winkler (Math. Nachr.; 2010; 283; 1664–1673) asserted global existence of bounded solutions for arbitrary $K > 0$. However, there is a gap in the proof. Recently, Fujie tried modifying the proof; nevertheless it also has a gap. It seems to be difficult to show global existence of bounded solutions for arbitrary $K > 0$. Moreover, the condition for K when $k > 1$ cannot connect to the condition when $k = 1$. The purpose of the present paper is to obtain global existence and boundedness under more natural and proper condition for χ and to build a mathematical bridge between the cases $k = 1$ and $k > 1$.

2010*Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 35K51; Secondary: 35B45, 35A01, 92C17.
Key words and phrases: chemotaxis; sensitivity function; global existence; boundedness.
*Corresponding author
†Partially supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C), No. 16K05182.

1. Introduction

The chemotaxis system proposed by Keller and Segel in [**9**] describes a part of the life cycle of cellular slime molds with chemotaxis. After the pioneering work [**9**], a number of variations of the chemotaxis system are proposed and investigated (see e.g., [**1, 6, 7**]).

In this paper we consider the Keller–Segel system with signal-dependent sensitivity

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u - \nabla \cdot (u\chi(v)\nabla v), & x \in \Omega,\ t > 0, \\ v_t = \Delta v + u - v, & x \in \Omega,\ t > 0, \\ \nabla u \cdot \nu = \nabla v \cdot \nu = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega,\ t > 0, \\ u(x,0) = u_0(x),\ v(x,0) = v_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ $(n \geq 2)$ with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ and ν is the outward normal vector to $\partial\Omega$. The initial data u_0 and v_0 are assumed to be nonnegative functions. The unknown function $u(x,t)$ represents the population density of species and $v(x,t)$ shows the concentration of the substance at place x and time t. As to the sensitivity function χ, we are interested in functions generalizing

$$\chi(s) = \frac{K}{s} \quad \text{and} \quad \chi(s) = \frac{K}{(1+s)^2} \qquad (s > 0).$$

In a mathematical view, the difficulty caused by the sensitivity function is to deal with the additional term $u\chi'(v)|\nabla v|^2$ which does not appear in the case that χ is a constant. Moreover, when χ is the singular sensitivity function, it is delicate to derive the estimate for $\frac{1}{v}$. In the case that $\chi(v) = \frac{K}{v}$, Winkler [**14**] first attained global existence of classical solutions when $K < \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}}$ and global existence of weak solutions when $K < \sqrt{\frac{n+2}{3n-4}}$. However, the result in [**14**] could not arrive at boundedness of solutions to (1.1). To overcome the difficulty in a singular sensitivity, Fujie [**2**] established the uniform-in-time lower estimate for v, and show global existence of classical bounded solutions to (1.1) in the case that $\chi(v) = \frac{K}{v}$ with

$$K < \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}}. \tag{1.2}$$

As to the problem (1.1) with $\chi(v) = \frac{K}{v}$ in the 2-dimensional setting, Lankeit [**10**] obtained global existence of classical bounded solutions when $K < \chi_0$ $(\chi_0 > 1)$. Futhermore Fujie–Senba [**4**] dealt with the 2-dimensional problem which was replaced v_t with τv_t in (1.1) and showed global existence and boundedness of radially symmetric solutions under the condition that $\chi(s) \to 0$ $(t \to \infty)$ and τ is sufficiently small. On the other hand, in the case that $\chi(v) \leq \frac{K}{(1+\alpha v)^k}$ $(k > 1,\ \alpha > 0,\ K > 0)$, Winkler [**13**] established global existence and boundedness in (1.1) without any restriction on $K > 0$. The result in [**13**] affected the result in [**5**] which mentioned global existence of classical bounded solutions to (1.1) when χ is the strong singular sensitivity function such that $\chi(v) = \frac{K}{v^k}$ for $k > 1$, and the method in [**13**] was used in Zhang–Li [**15**] and Zheng–Mu [**16**]. However, we cannot convince the result in [**13**] that global existence and boundedness hold for all $K > 0$, because there is a gap in the proof. Recently, Fujie tried modifying it; nevertheless it also

has a gap (cf. [**3**]). In general, it seems to be difficult to show global existence of bounded solutions for arbitrary $K > 0$. Moreover, if $k \to 1$, then the condition "arbitrary $K > 0$" cannot connect to (1.2).

The purpose of this paper is to obtain global existence and boundedness in (1.1) under a more natural and proper condition for χ and to build a mathematical bridge between the cases $k = 1$ and $k > 1$. We shall suppose that χ satisfies that

$$\chi(s) \le \frac{K}{(a+s)^k} \tag{1.3}$$

with some $k \ge 1$, $a \ge 0$ and $K > 0$ fulfiling

$$K < k(a+\eta)^{k-1}\sqrt{\frac{2}{n}}. \tag{1.4}$$

Here

$$\eta := \sup_{\tau>0}\left(\min\left\{e^{-2\tau}\min_{x\in\overline{\Omega}} v_0(x),\ c_0\|u_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)}(1-e^{-\tau})\right\}\right), \tag{1.5}$$

where $c_0 > 0$ is a lower bound for the fundamental solution of $w_t = \Delta w - w$ with Neumann boundary condition (for more detail, see Remark 2.1). We suppose that

$$0 \le u_0 \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \setminus \{0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} 0 < v_0 \in W^{1,q}(\Omega)\ (\exists\, q > n) & (a = 0), \\ 0 \le v_0 \in W^{1.q}(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}\ (\exists\, q > n) & (a > 0). \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

Now the main results read as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $n \ge 2$ and let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary. Assume that χ satisfies* (1.3) *with some $k \ge 1$, $a \ge 0$, $K > 0$ fulfiling* (1.4)*. Then for any u_0, v_0 satisfying* (1.6) *with some $q > n$, there exists an exactly one pair (u, v) of functions*

$$u,\ v \in C(\overline{\Omega} \times [0,\infty)) \cap C^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega} \times (0,\infty))$$

which solves (1.1)*. Moreover, the solution (u, v) is uniformly bounded, i.e., there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|u(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le C \quad \textit{for all } t \ge 0.$$

Remark 1.1. The unified condition (1.3) with $K > 0$ satisfying (1.4) may be a natural condition for χ. Indeed, when $k = 1$, (1.4) becomes (1.2):

$$K < \left(k(a+\eta)^{k-1}\sqrt{\frac{2}{n}}\right)\Bigg|_{k=1} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}}.$$

The main theorem tells us the result in the typical case of singular sensitivity.

Corollary 1.2. *Let $\chi(s) = \frac{K}{s}$ with $K < \sqrt{\frac{2}{n}}$. Then for any u_0, v_0 satisfying* (1.6) *with some $q > n$,* (1.1) *has a unique global bounded classical solution.*

The strategy for the proof of Theorem 1.1 is to construct the estimate for $\int_\Omega u^p$ with some $p > \frac{n}{2}$. One of the keys for this strategy is to derive the unified inequality

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega u^p\varphi(v) + \varepsilon p(p-1)\int_\Omega u^{p-2}\varphi(v)|\nabla u|^2 \le c\int_\Omega u^p\varphi(v) - r\int_\Omega u^{p+1}\frac{\varphi(v)}{(a+v)^k}$$

for some $\varepsilon \in [0,1)$ and $c > 0$, where

$$\varphi(s) := \exp\left\{-r\int_0^s \frac{1}{(a+s)^k}\,d\tau\right\}$$

with $r > 0$. This function φ constructed in [**11, 12**] unifies mathematical structures in the cases $k > 1$ and $k = 1$.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we collect basic facts which will be used later. In Section 3 we give a unified view point in energy estimates. Section 4 is devoted to the proof of global existence and boundedness (Theorem 1.1).

2. Preliminaries

In this section we will collect elementary results. We first recall the uniform-in-time lower estimate for v established by Fujie [**2, 3**].

Lemma 2.1. *Let $u_0 \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ and $u \in C(\overline{\Omega}\times[0,T))$ be nonnegative functions such that $u_0 \not\equiv 0$ and $\int_\Omega u(\cdot,t) = \int_\Omega u_0$ $(t \in [0,T))$. If $v_0 \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ is a positive function in $\overline{\Omega}$ and $v \in C^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega}\times(0,T)) \cap C(\overline{\Omega}\times[0,T))$ is a classical solution of*

$$\begin{cases} v_t = \Delta v - v + u, & x \in \Omega,\ t \in (0,T), \\ \nabla v\cdot\nu = 0 & x \in \partial\Omega,\ t \in (0,T), \\ v(x,0) = v_0(x) & x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$

then for all $t \in (0,T)$,

$$\inf_{x\in\Omega} v(x,t) \ge \eta > 0,$$

where $\eta > 0$ is defined as (1.5).

Remark 2.1. When Ω is a convex bounded domain, the proof of this lemma is given in [**2**, Lemma 2.2] and the constant η can be explicitly represented as

$$\eta := \sup_{\tau>0}\left(\min\left\{e^{-\tau}\min_{x\in\overline{\Omega}} v_0(x),\ \|u_0\|_{L^1(\Omega)}\cdot\int_0^\tau \frac{1}{(4\pi r)^{\frac{n}{2}}}e^{-\left(r+\frac{\left(\max_{x,y\in\overline{\Omega}}|x-y|\right)^2}{4r}\right)}\,dr\right\}\right).$$

On the other hand, if we do not assume the convexity of Ω, then using the positivity of the fundamental solution $U(t,x;s,y)$ to $w_t = \Delta w - w$ in $\Omega\times(0,T)$ with $\nabla w\cdot\nu = 0$ on $\partial\Omega\times(0,T)$ (see e.g., [**8**]), we have that there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that for all $\tau \in (0,\frac{T}{2})$,

$$U(s+\tau,x;s,y) = U(\tau,x;0,y) \ge c_0 > 0 \quad \text{for all } x,y \in \overline{\Omega},\ s > 0.$$

Then we can see the conclusion of Lemma 2.1 by a similar argument as in [**2**, Lemma 2.2].

We next recall the well-known result about local existence of solutions to (1.1) (see [**10**, Theorem 2.3], [**4**, Proposition 2.2] and [**13**, Lemma 2.1]).

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that χ satisfies* (1.3) *and the initial data u_0, v_0 fulfil* (1.6) *for some $q > n$. Then there exist $T_{\max} \in (0, \infty]$ and exactly one pair (u, v) of nonnegative functions*

$$u \in C(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, T_{\max})) \cap C^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega} \times (0, T_{\max})),$$
$$v \in C(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, T_{\max})) \cap C^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega} \times (0, T_{\max})) \cap L^{\infty}_{\rm loc}([0, T_{\max}); W^{1,q}(\Omega))$$

which solves (1.1) *in the classical sense and satisfies the mass conservation*

$$\int_{\Omega} u(\cdot, t) = \int_{\Omega} u_0 \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}) \tag{2.1}$$

and the lower estimate

$$\inf_{x \in \Omega} v(x, t) \geq \eta \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}), \tag{2.2}$$

where $\eta > 0$ is defined as (1.5). *Moreover, if $T_{\max} < \infty$, then*

$$\lim_{t \nearrow T_{\max}} (\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} + \|v(\cdot, t)\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)}) = \infty.$$

At the end of this section we shall recall the result about the estimate for v in dependence on boundedness features of u derived by a straightforward application of well-known smoothing estimates for the heat semigroup under homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions (see [**14**, Lemma 2.4] and [**2**, Lemma 2.4]).

Lemma 2.3. *Let $T > 0$ and $1 \leq \theta, \mu \leq \infty$. If $\frac{n}{2}(\frac{1}{\theta} - \frac{1}{\mu}) < 1$, then there exists $C_1(\mu, \theta) > 0$ such that*

$$\|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\mu}(\Omega)} \leq C_1(\mu, \theta) \left(1 + \sup_{s \in (0, \infty)} \|u(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{\theta}(\Omega)}\right) \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T).$$

3. A unified view point in energy estimates

Let (u, v) be the solution of (1.1) on $[0, T_{\max})$ as in Lemma 2.2. For the proof of Theorem 1.1 we will recall an useful fact to derive the L^{∞}-estimate for u.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that the solution u of* (1.1) *given in Lemma 2.2 satisfies*

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{p}(\Omega)} \leq C(p) \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}) \tag{3.1}$$

with some $p > \frac{n}{2}$ and $C(p) > 0$. Then there exists a constant $C' > 0$ such that

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \leq C' \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}).$$

Proof. Combination of (2.2) and the same argument as in [**14**, Lemma 3.4] leads to the conclusion of Lemma 3.1. □

Unified test function. Thanks to Lemmas 2.2 and 3.1 we will only make sure that the L^p-estimate for u with some $p > \frac{n}{2}$ to show global existence and boundedness of solutions to (1.1). To establish (3.1) we introduce the functions g and φ by

$$g(s) := -r \int_\eta^s \frac{1}{(a+\tau)^k}\, d\tau, \quad \varphi(s) := \exp\{g(s)\} \quad (s \geq \eta), \tag{3.2}$$

where $r > 0$ is a constant fixed later and η is defined as (1.5). When $k > 1$, by straightforward calculations we have

$$\varphi(s) = C_\varphi \exp\left\{ \frac{r}{(k-1)(a+s)^{k-1}} \right\}$$

with $C_\varphi = \exp\{-r(k-1)^{-1}(a+\eta)^{-k+1}\} > 0$, which is a similar function used in [**13**]. On the other hand, when $k = 1$, it follows that

$$\varphi(s) = \frac{C_\varphi}{(a+s)^r}$$

with some constant $C_\varphi = (a+\eta)^r > 0$, which is a similar function used in [**2**]. Now we shall prove the following unified inequality by using the test function $\varphi(v)$.

Lemma 3.2. *Assume that χ satisfies* (1.3). *Then for all $\varepsilon \in [0,1)$ there exists $c > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega u^p \varphi(v) + \varepsilon p(p-1)\int_\Omega u^{p-2}\varphi(v)|\nabla u|^2 \\ &\qquad \leq \int_\Omega u^p H_\varepsilon(v)\varphi(v)|\nabla v|^2 + c\int_\Omega u^p \varphi(v) - r\int_\Omega u^{p+1}\frac{\varphi(v)}{(a+v)^k}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

where

$$H_\varepsilon(s) := \frac{(\varepsilon p + 1 - \varepsilon)r^2}{(1-\varepsilon)(p-1)(a+s)^{2k}} + \frac{\varepsilon p K r}{(1-\varepsilon)(a+s)^{2k}} - \frac{kr}{(a+s)^{k+1}} + \frac{p(p-1)K^2}{4(1-\varepsilon)(a+s)^{2k}}.$$

Proof. We let $p \geq 1$. From (1.1) we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega u^p\varphi(v) = p\int_\Omega u^{p-1}\varphi(v)\nabla\cdot(\nabla u - u\chi(v)\nabla v) + \int_\Omega u^p\varphi'(v)(\Delta v - v + u). \tag{3.4}$$

Integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} &p\int_\Omega u^{p-1}\varphi(v)\nabla\cdot(\nabla u - u\chi(v)\nabla v) + \int_\Omega u^p\varphi'(v)\Delta v \\ &= -p\int_\Omega \nabla(u^{p-1}\varphi(v))\cdot(\nabla u - u\chi(v)\nabla v) - \int_\Omega \nabla(u^p\varphi'(v))\cdot\nabla v \\ &= -p(p-1)\int_\Omega u^{p-2}\varphi(v)|\nabla u|^2 + \int_\Omega u^{p-1}\left(p(p-1)\varphi(v)\chi(v) - 2p\varphi'(v)\right)\nabla u\cdot\nabla v \\ &\quad + \int_\Omega u^p(-\varphi''(v) + p\varphi'(v)\chi(v))|\nabla v|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

Invoking to the Young inequality, we infer that for all $\varepsilon \in [0,1)$,

$$\begin{aligned}(3.6)\quad &\int_\Omega u^{p-1}\left(p(p-1)\varphi(v)\chi(v)-2p\varphi'(v)\right)\nabla u\cdot\nabla v\\ &\le (1-\varepsilon)p(p-1)\int_\Omega u^{p-2}\varphi(v)|\nabla u|^2+\int_\Omega u^p\frac{(p(p-1)\varphi(v)\chi(v)-2p\varphi'(v))^2}{4(1-\varepsilon)p(p-1)\varphi(v)}|\nabla v|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Thus combination of (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6) yields that

$$(3.7)\quad \frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega u^p\varphi(v)+\varepsilon p(p-1)\int_\Omega u^{p-2}\varphi(v)|\nabla u|^2\le\int_\Omega u^pF_\varphi(v)|\nabla v|^2+\int_\Omega u^p\varphi'(v)(-v+u),$$

where

$$F_\varphi(s):=-\varphi''(s)-\frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}p\varphi'(s)\chi(s)+\frac{p(p-1)}{4(1-\varepsilon)}\chi(s)^2\varphi(s)+\frac{p\varphi'(s)^2}{(1-\varepsilon)(p-1)\varphi(s)}.$$

Noting that

$$\varphi'(s)=g'(s)\varphi(s)\quad\text{and}\quad\varphi''(s)=g''(s)\varphi(s)+g'(s)^2\varphi(s),$$

we can rewrite the function $F_\varphi(s)$ as

$$F_\varphi(s)=\left(-g''(s)-\frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}pg'(s)\chi(s)+\frac{p(p-1)}{4(1-\varepsilon)}\chi(s)^2+\frac{(\varepsilon p+1-\varepsilon)g'(s)^2}{(1-\varepsilon)(p-1)}\right)\varphi(s).$$

Recalling by (3.2) that

$$g'(s)=\frac{-r}{(a+s)^k}\quad\text{and}\quad g''(s)=\frac{rk}{(a+s)^{k+1}},$$

we see from (1.3) that

$$(3.8)\qquad F_\varphi(s)\le H_\varepsilon(s)\varphi(v),$$

where

$$H_\varepsilon(s):=\frac{(\varepsilon p+1-\varepsilon)r^2}{(1-\varepsilon)(p-1)(a+s)^{2k}}+\frac{\varepsilon pKr}{(1-\varepsilon)(a+s)^{2k}}-\frac{kr}{(a+s)^{k+1}}+\frac{p(p-1)K^2}{4(1-\varepsilon)(a+s)^{2k}}.$$

Therefore we obtain from (3.7) together with (3.8) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega u^p\varphi(v)+\varepsilon p(p-1)\int_\Omega u^{p-2}\varphi(v)|\nabla u|^2\\ &\qquad\le\int_\Omega u^pH_\varepsilon(v)\varphi(v)|\nabla v|^2-r\int_\Omega u^p\varphi(v)\frac{(-v+u)}{(a+v)^k}.\end{aligned}$$

We finally confirm from the boundedness of $\frac{s}{(a+s)^k}$ $(k\ge1)$ that there exists $c>0$ satisfying

$$\int_\Omega u^p\varphi(v)\frac{rv}{(a+v)^k}\le c\int_\Omega u^p\varphi(v),$$

and thus we obtain (3.3). □

4. Global existence and boundedness

In this section we will show the L^p-estimate for u with $p > \frac{n}{2}$ by using Lemma 3.2.

4.1. Energy estimate in the case $k > 1$

We first derive the energy estimate in the case $k > 1$. In this subsection we assume that χ satisfies (1.3) with some $k > 1$. Now we shall show the following inequality by modifying the method in [**11**].

Lemma 4.1. *Assume that* (1.3) *and* (1.4) *are satisfied with some* $k > 1$, $a \geq 0$ *and* $K > 0$. *Then there exist* $p > \frac{n}{2}$, $r > 0$ *and* $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ *such that*

$$H_\varepsilon(s) \leq 0 \quad \textit{for all } s \geq \eta,$$

where H_ε *is defined in Lemma 3.2 and* $\eta > 0$ *is defined as* (1.5), *which implies that*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega u^p\varphi(v) + \varepsilon p(p-1)\int_\Omega u^{p-2}\varphi(v)|\nabla u|^2 \leq c\int_\Omega u^p\varphi(v) - r\int_\Omega u^{p+1}\frac{\varphi(v)}{(a+v)^k}. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. We take $p \geq 1$, $r > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in [0, 1)$ which will be fixed later. Due to the definition of H_ε we write as

$$H_\varepsilon(s) = a_1(s)r^2 + a_2(s)r + a_3(s),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
a_1(s) &:= \frac{\varepsilon p + 1 - \varepsilon}{(1-\varepsilon)(p-1)(a+s)^{2k}},\\
a_2(s) &:= \frac{\varepsilon pK}{(1-\varepsilon)(a+s)^{2k}} - \frac{k}{(a+s)^{k+1}},\\
a_3(s) &:= \frac{p(p-1)K^2}{4(1-\varepsilon)(a+s)^{2k}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Noting from the condition (1.4) that there exist $p > \frac{n}{2}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ satisfying

$$K < \frac{(1-\varepsilon)k(a+\eta)^{k-1}}{\varepsilon p + \sqrt{p(\varepsilon p + 1 - \varepsilon)}},$$

we have that

$$\frac{\left(\varepsilon p + \sqrt{p(\varepsilon p + 1 - \varepsilon)}\right)}{1-\varepsilon}K \leq k(a+s)^{k-1} \quad \text{for all } s \geq \eta.$$

This implies that the discriminant

$$\begin{aligned}
D_r(s) &= a_2(s)^2 - 4a_1(s)a_3(s)\\
&= \left(\frac{\varepsilon pK}{(1-\varepsilon)(a+s)^{2k}} - \frac{k}{(a+s)^{k+1}}\right)^2 - \frac{p(\varepsilon p + 1 - \varepsilon)K^2}{(1-\varepsilon)^2(a+s)^{4k}}\\
&= \frac{1}{(a+s)^{4k}}\left(\left(\frac{\varepsilon pK}{(1-\varepsilon)} - k(a+s)^{k-1}\right)^2 - \frac{p(\varepsilon p + 1 - \varepsilon)K^2}{(1-\varepsilon)^2}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

is nonnegative for all $s \geq \eta$. Finally, we show that there exists $r > 0$ such that

$$H_\varepsilon(s) = a_1(s)r^2 + a_2(s)r + a_3(s) \leq 0 \tag{4.2}$$

for all $s \geq \eta$. Because $D_r(s)$ is nonnegative, we can define

$$\begin{aligned} r_\pm(s) &:= \frac{-a_2 \pm \sqrt{D_r(s)}}{2a_1(s)} \\ &= \frac{(1-\varepsilon)(p-1)}{2(\varepsilon p + 1 - \varepsilon)} \left(-\frac{\varepsilon p K}{(1-\varepsilon)} + k(a+s)^{k-1} \pm (a+s)^{2k}\sqrt{D_r(s)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then we see that $H_\varepsilon(s) \leq 0$ for each $s \geq \eta$ and all $r \in (r_-(s), r_+(s))$. Since the functions

$$\widetilde{r}_\pm(\tau) := \tau \pm \sqrt{\tau^2 - \frac{p(\varepsilon p + 1 - \varepsilon)K^2}{(1-\varepsilon)^2}} \qquad \left(\tau \geq \frac{K\sqrt{p(\varepsilon p + 1 - \varepsilon)}}{1-\varepsilon} \right)$$

satisfy that

$$\frac{d\widetilde{r}_+}{d\tau}(\tau) > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{d\widetilde{r}_-}{d\tau}(\tau) < 0$$

for all $\tau \geq \frac{K\sqrt{p(\varepsilon p+1-\varepsilon)}}{1-\varepsilon}$, we obtain that

$$r_-(s) \leq \widetilde{r}_- \left(\frac{K\sqrt{p(\varepsilon p + 1 - \varepsilon)}}{1-\varepsilon} \right) = \widetilde{r}_+ \left(\frac{K\sqrt{p(\varepsilon p + 1 - \varepsilon)}}{1-\varepsilon} \right) \leq r_+(s)$$

holds for all $s \geq \eta$. Therefore if we put

$$r_0 := \widetilde{r}_- \left(\frac{K\sqrt{p(\varepsilon p + 1 - \varepsilon)}}{1-\varepsilon} \right) = \frac{(p-1)K^2}{2}\sqrt{\frac{p}{\varepsilon p + 1 - \varepsilon}} > 0,$$

then $r = r_0 \in (r_-(s), r_+(s))$ for all $s \geq \eta$, which means that (4.2) holds for all $s \geq \eta$. This implies the end of the proof. □

Now we are ready to show the L^p-estimate in the case $k > 1$.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that* (1.3) *and* (1.4) *are satisfied with some* $k > 1$, $a \geq 0$ *and* $K > 0$. *Then there exist* $p > \frac{n}{2}$ *and* $C > 0$ *such that*

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C \quad \textit{for all } t > 0.$$

Proof. The proof is similar as in [**13**]. From Lemmas 3.2 and 4.1 we obtain (4.1) with some $p > \frac{n}{2}$, $r > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. We shall show the L^p-estimate for u by using (4.1). From the positivity of u, v and φ we have that

$$-r \int_\Omega u^{p+1} \frac{\varphi(v)}{(a+v)^k} \leq 0. \tag{4.3}$$

We next deal with the term $\int_\Omega u^{p-1}\varphi(v)|\nabla u|^2$. Noting the boundedness of φ:

$$C_\varphi \le \varphi(s) \le 1 \quad (s \ge \eta) \tag{4.4}$$

and combining the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality with the mass conservation property (2.1), we deduce that there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega u^p\varphi(v) &\le \int_\Omega u^p = \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \\ &\le c_1\left(\|\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^{\frac{2}{p}}(\Omega)}\right)^{2a}\|u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|^{2(1-a)}_{L^{\frac{2}{p}}(\Omega)} \\ &= c_1\left(\|\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|u_0\|^{\frac{p}{2}}_{L^1(\Omega)}\right)^{2a}\|u_0\|^{p(1-a)}_{L^1(\Omega)}\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

with $a = \frac{\frac{2n}{p}-\frac{n}{2}}{\frac{2n}{p}+1-\frac{n}{2}} \in (0,1)$. From (4.1), (4.3) and combination of (4.5) and

$$C_\varphi\int_\Omega |\nabla u^{\frac{p}{2}}|^2 \le \int_\Omega u^{p-2}\varphi(v)|\nabla u|^2$$

we see that there exist $c_2, c_3 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega u^p\varphi(v) \le c\int_\Omega u^p\varphi(v) - c_2\left(\int_\Omega u^p\varphi(v)\right)^{\frac{1}{a}} + c_3,$$

which implies that there exist $p > \frac{n}{2}$, $r > 0$ (determined in Lemma 4.1) and $C > 0$ satisfying

$$\int_\Omega u^p\varphi(v) \le C.$$

Therefore we obtain from (4.4) that

$$\int_\Omega u^p \le CC_\varphi^{-1}.$$

Thus we attain the goal of the proof. □

4.2. Energy estimates in the case $k = 1$

In this section we assume that the sensitivity function χ satisfies (1.3) with $k = 1$. We first show the following estimate for $H_0(s)$.

Lemma 4.3. *Assume that* (1.3) *and* (1.4) *are satisfied with* $k = 1$ *and with some* $a \ge 0$ *and* $K > 0$. *Then for all* $p \in (1, \frac{1}{K^2})$ *there exists an interval* I_p *such that for all* $r \in I_p$ *and* $s \ge \eta$,

$$H_0(s) \le 0,$$

where H_0 *is defined as in Lemma 3.2 with* $\varepsilon = 0$, *which means*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega u^p\varphi(v) \le c\int_\Omega u^p\varphi(v) - r\int_\Omega u^{p+1}\frac{\varphi(v)}{a+v}. \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. We pick $p \geq 1$ and $r > 0$ which will be fixed later. Due to the definition of $H_0(s)$ we write as

$$\begin{aligned} H_0(s) &= \frac{1}{(a+s)^2}\left(\frac{1}{p-1}r^2 - r + \frac{p(p-1)K^2}{4}\right) \\ &=: \frac{b_1 r^2 + b_2 r + b_3}{(a+s)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

From (1.4) we note that $(1, \frac{1}{K^2})$ is not an empty set. If we choose $p \in (1, \frac{1}{K^2})$, then the discriminant of $b_1 r^2 + b_2 r + b_3$ is nonnegative:

$$D_r = 1 - pK^2 \geq 0.$$

Thus we can define the interval I_p as

$$I_p := \left(\frac{p-1}{2}\left(1 - \sqrt{1-pK^2}\right), \frac{p-1}{2}\left(1 + \sqrt{1-pK^2}\right)\right)$$

for each $p \in (1, \frac{1}{K^2})$. Then we have from straightforward calculations that for each $p \in (1, \frac{1}{K^2})$ and all $r \in I_p$, $b_1 r^2 + b_2 r + b_3 \leq 0$ holds, which yields that for all $p \in (1, \frac{1}{K^2})$ there exists the interval I_p such that

$$H_0(s) \leq 0$$

for all $r \in I_p$. This implies the end of the proof. □

We next show the estimate for $\int_\Omega u^p \varphi(v)$. However we cannot easily obtain the estimate for $\int_\Omega u^p$ because φ is not a bounded function. Therefore we will show the following lemma, which has an important role for obtaining the L^p-estimate.

Lemma 4.4. *Assume that* (1.3) *and* (1.4) *are satisfied with* $k = 1$ *and with some* $a \geq 0$ *and* $K > 0$. *Suppose that* $p \in (1, \frac{1}{K^2})$, $r \in I_p$ *such that* $p - r \geq 1$. *If there exists* $C > 0$ *such that*

$$\|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{p-r}(\Omega)} \leq C \quad \text{for all } t > 0, \tag{4.7}$$

then there exists $C_2(p, r) > 0$ *satisfying*

$$\int_\Omega u^p \varphi(v) \leq C_2(p, r) \quad \text{for all } t > 0.$$

Proof. The proof is similar as in [**2**]. We let $p \in (1, \frac{1}{K^2})$. We denote by I_p the interval defined in Lemma 4.3, and choose $r \in I_p$. We shall attain the conclusion from (4.6). By virtue of the Hölder inequality, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega u^p \varphi(v) &= C_\varphi^{-\frac{p}{p+1}} \int_\Omega \left(u^{p+1} \frac{C_\varphi}{(a+v)^{r+1}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+1}} \cdot (a+v)^{-r+\frac{p(r+1)}{p+1}} \\ &\leq C_\varphi^{-\frac{p}{p+1}} \left(\int_\Omega u^{p+1} \frac{C_\varphi}{(a+v)^{r+1}}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+1}} \left(\int_\Omega (a+v)^{p-r}\right)^{\frac{1}{p+1}} \\ &= C_\varphi^{-\frac{p}{p+1}} \left(\int_\Omega u^{p+1} \frac{\varphi(v)}{a+v}\right)^{\frac{p}{p+1}} \left(\int_\Omega (a+v)^{p-r}\right)^{\frac{1}{p+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Noting from (4.7) and the fact $p - r \geq 1$ that

$$\|a + v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{p-r}(\Omega)} \leq a + C \quad \text{for all } t > 0,$$

we obtain that there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\int_\Omega u^p \varphi(v) \leq c_1 \left(\int_\Omega u^{p+1} \frac{\varphi(v)}{a+v} \right)^{\frac{p}{p+1}}. \tag{4.8}$$

Plugging (4.8) into (4.6) yields that there exists $c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega u^p \varphi(v) \leq c \int_\Omega u^p \varphi(v) - c_2 \left(\int_\Omega u^p \varphi(v) \right)^{\frac{p+1}{p}}.$$

Therefore we have from a standard ODE comparison argument that there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_\Omega u^p \varphi(v) \leq C,$$

which means the end of the proof. □

Lemma 4.5. *Assume that* (1.3) *and* (1.4) *are satisfied with* $k = 1$ *and with some* $a \geq 0$ *and* $K > 0$. *Then there exist* $p > \frac{n}{2}$ *and* $C > 0$ *such that*

$$\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C.$$

Proof. We use a similar argument as in [**2**, Proof of Main Theorem (Step 1)]. First we choose a pair (p_0, r_0) such that

$$\begin{cases} p_0 \in \left(1, \min\left\{ \dfrac{1}{K^2}, n+1, \dfrac{n+2}{n-2} \right\}\right), \\ r_0 := \dfrac{p_0 - 1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Then $p_0 > r_0$, $r_0 < \frac{n}{2}$, $r_0 \in I_p$, $p_0 - r_0 \geq 1$ and $p_0 - r_0 < \frac{n}{n-2}$. Since $\frac{n}{2}(1 - \frac{1}{p_0 - r_0}) < 1$ from the inequality $p_0 - r_0 < \frac{n}{n-2}$, it follows from Lemma 2.3 and (2.1) that there exists $b_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|v(\cdot, t)\|_{L^{p_0 - r_0}(\Omega)} \leq C_1(p_0 - r_0, 1) \left(1 + \sup_{s \in (0,\infty)} \|u(\cdot, s)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \right) \leq b_0.$$

Thus we have from the fact $p_0 - r_0 \geq 1$ and Lemma 4.4 that

$$\int_\Omega u^{p_0} (a+v)^{-r_0} \leq C_\varphi^{r_0} C_2(p_0, r_0).$$

We will show that for all $q_0 \in (\frac{2p_0}{p_0+1}, \min\{p_0, \frac{n(p_0 - r_0)}{n - 2r_0}\})$ there exists $b_0' > 0$ such that

$$\int_\Omega u^{q_0} \leq b_0'. \tag{4.9}$$

We first note from the fact $p_0 \notin (\frac{n}{n+4}, 1)$ that

$$\frac{2p_0}{p_0+1} \le p_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{2p_0}{p_0+1} \le \frac{n(p_0+1)}{2(n-p_0+1)} = \frac{n(p_0-r_0)}{n-2r_0}.$$

Now we fix $q_0 \in (\frac{2p_0}{p_0+1}, \min\{p_0, \frac{n(p_0-r_0)}{n-2r_0}\})$. Applying the Hölder inequality, we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega u^{q_0} &\le \left(\int_\Omega u^{p_0} (a+v)^{-r_0} \right)^{\frac{r_0}{p_0}} \cdot \left(\int_\Omega (a+v)^{\frac{q_0 r_0}{p_0 - q_0}} \right)^{\frac{p_0-r_0}{p_0}} \\ &\le \left(C_\varphi^{r_0} C_2(p_0, r_0) \right)^{\frac{r_0}{p_0}} \cdot \|a+v(\cdot,t)\|_{L^{\frac{q_0 r_0}{p_0-r_0}}(\Omega)}^{\frac{q_0 r_0}{p_0}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

We can confirm from the fact $\frac{n}{2}(\frac{1}{q_0} - \frac{p_0-q_0}{q_0 r_0}) < 1$ and Lemma 2.3 that

$$\|v(\cdot,t)\|_{L^{\frac{q_0 r_0}{p_0-r_0}}(\Omega)} \le C_1 \left(\frac{q_0 r_0}{p_0 - r_0}, q_0 \right) \left(1 + \sup_{s \in (0,\infty)} \|u(\cdot,s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \right). \tag{4.11}$$

Therefore plugging (4.11) and the inequality $\frac{q_0 r_0}{p_0 - r_0} \ge 1$ (from the fact $q_0 \ge \frac{2p_0}{p_0+1}$) into (4.10) derives that there exists $b_0'' > 0$ satisfying

$$\|u(\cdot,t)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \le b_0'' \left(1 + \sup_{s \in (0,\infty)} \|u(\cdot,s)\|_{L^{q_0}(\Omega)} \right)^{\frac{r_0}{p_0}}.$$

Noting that $\frac{r_0}{p_0} < 1$, we obtain (4.9). In the above argument, since $\frac{n}{2} < \min\{\frac{1}{K^2}, n+1\}$, if $\frac{n+2}{n-2} > \frac{n}{2}$, then we can fix $p_0 > \frac{n}{2}$. Thus we can find $q_0 > \frac{n}{2}$ due to $p_0 < \frac{n(p_0+1)}{2(n-p_0+1)} = \frac{n(p_0-r_0)}{n-2r_0}$ if $\frac{n+2}{n-2} > \frac{n}{2}$. On the other hand, if $\frac{n+2}{n-2} \le \frac{n}{2}$, then we proceed the iteration argument. For all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we fix a pair (p_i, r_i) defined inductively such as

$$\begin{cases} p_i \in \left(p_{i-1}, \min\left\{ \dfrac{1}{K^2}, n+1, \dfrac{p_{i-1}(n+2)}{n-2p_{i-1}} \right\} \right), \\ r_i := \dfrac{p_i - 1}{2}, \end{cases}$$

then we can see that $p_i > r_i$, $r_i < \frac{n}{2}$ and $r_i \in I_{p_i}$. Moreover, since the relation $p_i < \frac{p_{i-1}(n+2)}{n-2p_{i-1}}$ implies that

$$p_i - r_i < \frac{n \cdot \frac{n(p_{i-1}+1)}{2(n-p_{i-1}+1)}}{n - 2 \cdot \frac{n(p_{i-1}+1)}{2(n-p_{i-1}+1)}},$$

we can find some $q_{i-1} \in (\frac{2p_{i-1}}{p_{i-1}+1}, \min\{p_{i-1}, \frac{n(p_{i-1}+1)}{2(n-p_{i-1}+1)}\})$ satisfying

$$p_i - r_i < \frac{n q_{i-1}}{n - 2q_{i-1}},$$

which means that $\frac{n}{2}(\frac{1}{q_{i-1}} - \frac{1}{p_i - r_i}) < 1$. Therefore we obtain

$$\|v(\cdot,t)\|_{L^{p_i - r_i}(\Omega)} \le C_1(p_i - r_i, q_{i-1}) \left(1 + \sup_{s \in (0,\infty)} \|u(\cdot,s)\|_{L^{q_{i-1}}(\Omega)} \right). \tag{4.12}$$

According to (4.12) and $p_i - r_i \geq 1$ into Lemma 4.4, we have

$$\int_\Omega u^{p_i}(a+v)^{-r_i} \leq C_\varphi^{r_i} C_2(p_i, r_i).$$

Due to a similar argument to the first iteration, we can show that

$$\|u(\cdot,t)\|_{L^{q_i}(\Omega)} \leq b_i'(q_i) \qquad \text{for all } q_i \in \left(\frac{2p_i}{p_i+1}, \min\left\{p_i, \frac{n(p_i-r_i)}{n-2r_i}\right\}\right)$$

with some constant $b_i'(q_i) > 0$. Because the increasing function $f(x) := \frac{x(n+2)}{n-2x}$ satisfies $f(x) > 1$ and $f(x) \to \infty$ as $x \to \frac{n}{2}$, we can find some $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $p_{i_0} > \frac{n}{2}$ and $p_{i_0-1} \leq \frac{n}{2}$, and hence $q_{i_0} > \frac{n}{2}$. Therefore we verify

$$\|u(\cdot,t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq C$$

with some $p > \frac{n}{2}$ and some $C > 0$, which completes the proof. □

4.3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

Combination of the L^p-estimate for u (see Lemma 4.2 or Lemma 4.5) and Lemma 3.1 directly leads to Theorem 1.1. □

References

[1] N. Bellomo, A. Bellouquid, Y. Tao, M. Winkler, *Toward a mathematical theory of Keller–Segel models of pattern formation in biological tissues*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci. **25** (2015), 1663–1763.

[2] K. Fujie, *Boundedness in a fully parabolic chemotaxis system with singular sensitivity*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **424** (2015), 675–684.

[3] K. Fujie, *Study of reaction-diffusion systems modeling chemotaxis*, Doctoral thesis, 2016.

[4] K. Fujie, T. Senba, *Global existence and boundedness of radial solutions to a two dimensional fully parabolic chemotaxis system with general sensitivity*, Nonlinearity, to appear.

[5] K. Fujie, T. Yokota, *Boundedness in a fully parabolic chemotaxis system with strongly singular sensitivity*, Appl. Math. Lett. **38** (2014), 140–143.

[6] T. Hillen, K. J. Painter, *A user's guide to PDE models for chemotaxis*, J. Math. Biol. **58** (2009), 183–217.

[7] D. Horstmann, *From 1970 until present: the Keller–Segel model in chemotaxis and its consequences*, Jahresber. Deutsch. Math. -Verein. **106** (2004), 51–69.

[8] S. Itô, *Diffusion equations*, Translated from the 1979 Japanese original by the author. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 114. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1992.

[9] E. F. Keller, L. A. Segel, *Initiation of slime mold aggregation viewed as an instability*, J. Theor. Biol. **26** (1970), 399–415.

[10] J. Lankeit, *A new approach toward boundedness in a two-dimensional parabolic chemotaxis system with singular sensitivity*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci. **39** (2016), 394–404.

[11] M. Mizukami, T. Yokota, *Global existence and asymptotic stability of solutions to a two-species chemotaxis system with any chemical diffusion*, J. Differential Equations **261** (2016), 2650–2669.

[12] M. Negreanu, J. I. Tello, *On a two species chemotaxis model with slow chemical diffusion*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **46** (2014), 3761–3781.

[13] M. Winkler, *Absence of collapse in a parabolic chemotaxis system with signal-dependent sensitivity*, Math. Nachr. **283** (2010), 1664–1673.

[14] M. Winkler, *Global solutions in a fully parabolic chemotaxis system with singular sensitivity*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci. **34** (2011), 176–190.

[15] Q. Zhang, Y. Li, *Global boundedness of solutions to a two-species chemotaxis system*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys. **66** (2015), 83–93.

[16] P. Zheng, C. Mu, *Global existence of solutions for a fully parabolic chemotaxis system with consumption of chemoattractant and logistic source*, Math. Nachr. **288** (2015), 710–720.